

REMARKS

The Examiner is thanked for his careful review of this application. Claim 3 was canceled. Claims 1-2 and 4-31 are pending after entry of the present amendment.

The Examiner noted that informal drawings were filed with this application. Formal drawings will be submitted upon allowance.

Claims 1, 2, and 26-31 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. Section 102(b) as being anticipated over Freeman (US 5,396,284). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Freeman teaches a motion detection system. The system is designed to determine when motion has occurred by using a time division multiplexing system 60 that is interfaced with a motion detection system 10. The motion detection system is connected to cameras C1-Cn, and the time division multiplexing system 60. As taught by Freeman, time division multiplexing is used to enhance the system's ability to handle large volumes of data and to more efficiently perform comparisons of sampled data. Although Freeman teaches algorithms for detecting multiplexing video signals and determining when motion has occurred, Freeman is silent in regard to several features of independent claims 1 and 26. In regard to claim 1, as amended, Freeman does not teach methods for notifying an interested user of activity by transmitting a surveillance image to a remote computer over a network. In regard to claim 26, as amended, Freeman does not teach transmission of a message over a network to a remote computer upon an alarm condition. Further, Freeman does not teach including a message with a video clip to enabling viewing of the activity condition that caused the signaling of the alarm condition.

For at least these reasons, it is submitted that Freeman fails to anticipate claims 1, 2, and 26-31 under Section 102. The Applicants therefore respectfully request that this Section 102 rejection be withdrawn.

Claims 8, 9, and 12-18 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. Section 102(b) as being anticipated over Peters (US 5,717,379). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Peters teaches a system for remote motoring. This system, as taught, is designed to be used in conjunction with a central station. The central station is designed to have operators that are able to dial into a remote location, and once a connection is established, determine if the remote location is safe for a person that is being protected. As described, the person that is protected, can place a call to the control station and ask the control station operator to inquire as to the safety of the person's destination (e.g., his home). The control station operator will then establish a connection, interrogate video data, and then determine if

the property is safe for the person before the person arrives or enters the location. (see Col. 5, lines 9-28).

Peters fails to anticipate claims 8, 9, and 12-18. Although Peters fails to teach a number of features of independent claim 8, Peters notability fails to teach an automated system that can automatically forward images to a remote computer of a network when an activity condition is present. Instead, the teachings of Peters emphasize the use of a passive system that can only provide video images after a person initiates a request.

As Peters fails to teach each element of pending claim 8, as amended, the Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner withdraw this rejection.

The Applicants also respectfully traverse the rejection of claims 19-25. It is respectfully submitted that Peters fails to teach each and every limitation of pending claims 19-25, and therefore, respectfully request the withdrawal of this rejection.

Claims 1, 2, and 26-31 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. Section 102(b) as being anticipated over Brown (US 5,455,561). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Brown is directed toward automatic security monitoring. Brown teaches a method for determining when security has been breached, and then triggering a videotaping of an event. By only videotaping a period of time determined to be critical, Brown is able to avoid having to continuously videotape a location. This prevents the taping of unnecessary dead time and avoids having to reload the system with fresh tapes continuously. It is submitted that Brown also fails to teach each and every element of independent claims 1 and 26. Most notably, Brown does not teach the transmitting of a surveillance image to a remote computer over a network after activity is detected. Further, there is not mention or suggestion regarding the transmitting of a message with a video clip to enable viewing of the activity condition from the remote computer. For at least these reasons, it is submitted that Brown fails to anticipate claims 1, 2, and 26-31. The Applicants therefore respectfully request that the Examiner withdraw this rejection.

Claims 3-7 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. Section 103(a), as being unpatentable over Freeman in view of Cohen (US 6,094,134). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Cohen teaches a system verification of an alarm. This system, as taught, is used to verify that an alarm was valid using existing alarm systems. Once a conventional alarm is triggered, the system can be manually actuated to verify if the alarm was proper or not. Freeman, as noted above, merely provides a system for time division multiplexing, such that less data is needed to determine when alarm violations have occurred. A combination of Cohen with Freeman, it is submitted, would not render claims 3-7 obvious. Neither reference teaches nor suggest combining features to arrive at the inventions defined by claims 3-7.

Most notably, both references are silent as to the claimed notification automatically when an activity condition is detected. The teaches of Cohen, to the contrary, would tend to suggest to one of ordinary skill in the art, that an existing alarm system with module cards be used. There is no teaching of automated transmissions of an image or video clips, and no suggestion can be drawn from the combined references themselves to arrive at the claimed invention. Accordingly, the Applicants respectfully request that this rejection be withdrawn.

Claims 10 and 11 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. Section 103(a), as being unpatentable over Peters. This rejection is respectfully traversed. As discussed above, Peters discloses a system that emphasizes the importance of a central station, and the need to call central station personnel to ascertain whether desired premises are safe. In fact, Peters notes that the station itself must call into the desired location to ascertain the condition before providing clearance. To one of ordinary skill in the art, Peters would not be suggesting the claimed invention of claims 10 nor 11. Although official notice is taken as to the possibility of using E-mail messages and the Internet, Peters does not suggest nor does it provide the motivation to combine E-mail nor Internet capabilities to its central station model. For at least these reasons, the Applicants respectfully submit that claims 10 and 11 are patentable over Peters and respectfully requests that the Examiner withdraw this rejection.

The Applicants acknowledge that this application claims priority from provisional Application 60/051,489 filed July 1, 1997. Accordingly, the Applicants submit that claims 1-31 are not anticipated by Seeley et al. (US 6,069,655) under 35 U.S.C. Section 102(a).

The Applicant therefore respectfully submits that all of the pending claims are in condition for allowance. A notice of allowance is respectfully requested. If the Examiner has any questions concerning the present amendment, the Examiner is kindly requested to contact the undersigned at (408) 749-6903. If any additional fees are due in connection with filing this amendment, the Commissioner is also authorized to charge Deposit Account No. 50-0805 (Order No. ATC97-1). A duplicate copy of the transmittal is enclosed for this purpose.

Respectfully submitted,
MARTINE PENILLA & KIM, L.L.P.



Albert S. Penilla, Esq.
Reg. No. 39,487

Martine Penilla & Kim, LLP
710 Lakeway Drive, Suite 170
Sunnyvale, California 94085
(408) 749-6903